UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,766	03/26/2004	Geoffrey R. Kruse	M61.12-0629	9088

27366   7590   03/18/2009
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
SUITE 1400
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
CAO, PHUONG THAO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/18/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/810,766	KRUSE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phuong-Thao Cao	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 December 2008*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-18 and 20* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-18 and 20* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/5/2009*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to Amendment filed on 12/12/2008.

2.   Claims 1, 5, 7, 12, 13 and 18 have been amended and claims 2, 3, 19 and 21-23 were

previously cancelled. Currently, claims 1, 4-18 and 20 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed by Applicant on 03/05/2009 has been

received and considered. A copy of the reviewed IDS is enclosed with this Office letter.

Response to Amendment

4.   Amendment to the specification has been received and entered.

5.   Amendment to the claims is effective to overcome the 112, 2nd paragraph rejection in the

previous Office action. Therefore, the previous 112, 2nd paragraph rejection has been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-18 and 20 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

8.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9.   Claims 1, 4-18 and 20 (effective filing date 3/26/2004) are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Majeed</u> (US Patent No 7,203,660, effective filing date

4/9/2001) in view of <u>Thompson et al.</u> (US Patent No 6,668,253; effective filing date 9/8/1999).

As to claim 1, <u>Majeed</u> teaches:

"A computer system that includes components stored on a computer storage medium"

(see Majeed, Abstract), the components comprising:

"a uniform interface, having a set of defined options, configured to receive a generalized

request from a report object and, based upon information included in the generalized request,

access data from a database and return the accessed data to the report object, the report object

being configured to operate without directly accessing the database" (see Majeed, Fig. 6 and

[column 17, lines 35-41] for an interface having a set of defined options; and also see Fig. 4 and

[column 13, lines 28-36] wherein the DDSAS as disclosed is interpreted as uniform interface as

recited and the Information Server Module is interpreted as report object),

"wherein at least one staging table, having a standardized structure which is independent

of business rules of the database, is utilized by the uniform interface to store at least a portion of

the accessed data" (see Majeed, [column 35, lines 41-65] wherein Table Section in the DDSAS

including a table storing query result for sorting, ranking and formatting the result data is

interpreted as Applicant's "staging table"; also see [column 39, lines 58-67]),

"wherein the uniform interface is further configured to access the data from the database

by translating the generalized request into a specific query which, upon execution, populates the

at least one staging table with the accessed data" (see Majeed, [column 13, lines 28-36] and

[column 39, lines 58-65] wherein request for report or Accesser's DSR (Demand Survey

Request) is interpreted as generalized request and SQL query is interpreted as specific query as

recited), and

"wherein the uniform interface is further configured to, in response to the generalized

request, query the at least one staging table to retrieve the accessed data and to return the

accessed data to the report object after execution of the specific query that populates the at least

one staging table" (see Majeed, [column 35, lines 45-55] and [column 39, lines 57-67] for

processing results in a table (Table Section) of DDSAT (uniform interface) before returned the

results to the Accesser (report object) wherein the table or Table Section is interpreted as

equivalent to staging table), and

"wherein columns in the at least one staging table are related to the set of defined options

of the uniform interface" (see Majeed, Fig. 17 and Fig. 22 for the relationship between defined

option of the interface (Fig. 17) and columns of the report (Fig. 22) wherein columns of the

report represents columns of the Table Section that hold the result data for formatting before

reporting).

However, Majeed does not teach the database as a general ledger database.

On the other hand, Thompson et al. teach a general ledger database (see Thompson et al.,

[column 25, lines 29-33]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified the system of Majeed by the teaching of Thompson et al.

by modifying the system of Majeed to use with the general ledger database. Skilled artisan

would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Majeed, [column 12, lines 15-20] that user

can use the system to request for report on financial account (i.e., user's accounts and/or

transactions). Accessing and reporting data from a general ledger database using the system of

Majeed allows user with effective way to access reports regarding financial information.

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Majeed and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the at least one staging table is an account code table" (see Thompson et al., [column 25, lines 44-47] for Account Tables).

As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Majeed and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein at least one staging table is an account balance staging table" (see Thompson et al., [column 25, lines 60-65] for Financial Account Balance Table).

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Majeed and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the at least one staging table is a column filter staging table" (see Thompson et al., [column 11, lines 9-12] for a list of predefined query filters which is equivalent to Applicant's "column filter staging table").

As to claim 7, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Majeed and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the generalized request includes at least one natural account is translated into at least one account code, which is stored in an account staging table" (see Thompson et al., Fig. 25A for account sequence which is equivalent to Applicant's "account code").

As to claim 8, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 7 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Majeed and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the specific query, into which the generalized request is translated by the uniform interface, comprises a single sequential query language (SQL) statement that joins the account staging table with a balance table of the general ledger database, such that balance information for an entire report column is retrieved by execution of the single SQL statement" (see Majeed, [column 23, lines 60-65] for database operations, e.g., joins, between tables and see [column 23, lines 20-25] for accessing data from tables using an SQL query; also see Thompson et al., [column 26, lines 30-45 and 53-56] for ability to combine the financial information which is equivalent to Applicant's "joins").

As to claim 9, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Majeed and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the balance information comprises current balance amounts for each account code in the account staging table" (see Thompson et al., [column 25, lines 60-65] wherein each

of GL accounts is equivalent to Applicant's "account code" and account balances is equivalent to

Applicant's "balance amounts", and Fig. 25C for balance amount item).

As to claim 10, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Majeed and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the balance information comprises year-to-date balance amounts for each

account code in the account staging table" (see Thompson et al., [column 30-35 and 60-65]

wherein each of GL accounts is equivalent to Applicant's "account code" and account balances

is equivalent to Applicant's "balance amounts", and Fig. 25C for EOY beginning balance and

EOY ending balance which is equivalent to Applicant's "year-to-date balance").

As to claim 11, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Majeed and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the generalized request further comprises account filter criteria, and wherein a

WHERE clause of the single SQL statement is configured to include the account filter criteria"

(see Thompson et al., [column 10, lines 1-15 and 40-45] and [column 26, lines 30-40] for the

function of filtering information including financial information).

As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Majeed and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the generalized request includes at least one natural account and account filter criteria, and wherein, with the help of the uniform interface, the at least one natural account is translated into at least one account code, which is stored in an account staging table, and wherein account codes that match the account filter criteria are stored in a column filter staging table" (see Thompson et al., Fig. 25A for account sequence which is equivalent to Applicant's "account code", and see [column 11, lines 9-15] and [column 10, lines 1-15] for filtering information and see [column 25, lines 20-60] and Fig. 25A for account number which is equivalent to Applicant's "natural account" and account sequence which is equivalent to Applicant's "account code").

As to claim 13, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 12 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Majeed and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the specific query, into which the generalized request is translated by the uniform interface, comprises a single sequential query language (SQL) statement that joins the account staging table with the column filter staging table and with a balance table of the general ledger database, such that balance information for an entire report column is retrieved by execution of the single SQL statement" (see Thompson et al., [column 26, lines 30-45] and [column 31, lines 35-45] for ability to combine the financial information which is equivalent to Applicant's "joins" and in addition, retrieving information from tables requires the join among the tables wherein 'join' operation can be performed by an SQL statement).

As to claim 14, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Majeed and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the balance information comprises current balance amounts for each account code in the account staging table" (see Majeed, [column 25, lines 30-35 and 60-65] wherein each of GL accounts is equivalent to Applicant's "account code" and account balances is equivalent to Applicant's "balance amounts", and Fig. 25C for balance amount item).

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Majeed and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the balance information comprises year-to-date balance amounts for each account code in the account staging table" (see Thompson et al., [column 30-35 and 60-65] wherein each of GL accounts is equivalent to Applicant's "account code" and account balances is equivalent to Applicant's "balance amounts", and Fig. 25C for EOY beginning balance and EOY ending balance which is equivalent to Applicant's "year-to-date balance").

As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Majeed and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the at least one staging table is a temporary table" (see Thompson et al., [column 25, lines 15-17] wherein a Summary Temporary Table is a temporary staging table).

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Majeed and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the at least one staging table is a permanent table" (see Thompson et al., [column 25, lines 17-22] wherein a Summary (permanent) Table is a permanent staging table).

As to claim 18, Majeed teach:

"A computer implemented method of retrieving data, from a database, to satisfy a generalized request from a report object" (see Majeed, Abstract, Fig. 1 and [column 39, lines 35-67] for retrieving data from Demand Database to satisfy the Accesser's Demand Survey Request (DSR)), comprising:

"receiving, in a uniform interface having a set of defined options, the generalized request from the report object" (see Majeed, Fig. 6 and [column 17, lines 35-41] for an interface having a set of defined options; and see [column 39, lines 35-46] for receiving DSR from Accesser);

"accessing, based on information included in the generalized request, data from the database" (see Majeed, [column 39, lines 57-65]);

"utilizing at least one staging table, having a standardized structure which is independent of business rules of the database, to store at least a portion of the accessed data on a computer storage medium before it is returned to the report object from the staging table in response to the generalized request" (see Majeed, [column 35, lines 45-55] and [column 39, lines 57-67] for processing results in a table (Table Section) of DDSAT (uniform interface) before returned the

results to the Accesser (report object) wherein the table or Table Section is interpreted as

equivalent to staging table),

"wherein the report object is configured to operate without directly accessing the

database" (see Majeed, Fig. 4 wherein the Information Server Module (i.e., report object) does

not directly accessing the database), and

"wherein columns in the at least one staging table are related to the set of defined options

of the uniform interface" (see Majeed, Fig. 17 and Fig. 22 for the relationship between defined

option of the interface (Fig. 17) and columns of the report (Fig. 22) wherein columns of the

report represents columns of the Table Section that hold the result data for formatting before

reporting).

However, Majeed does not teach the database as a general ledger database.

On the other hand, Thompson et al. teach a general ledger database (see Thompson et al.,

[column 25, lines 29-33]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified the system of Majeed by the teaching of Thompson et al.

by modifying the system of Majeed to use with the general ledger database. Skilled artisan

would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Majeed, [column 12, lines 15-20] that user

can use the system to request for report on financial account (i.e., user's accounts and/or

transactions). Accessing and reporting data from a general ledger database using the system of

Majeed allows user with effective way to access reports regarding financial information.

As to claim 20, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Majeed and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the at least one staging table is a temporary table" (see Thompson et al.,

[column 25, lines 15-17] wherein a Summary Temporary Table is a temporary staging table).

Conclusion

10.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

    A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571)272-2735.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

    If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hung T Vy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2163

Phuong-Thao Cao, Examiner
Art Unit 2164
March 10, 2009